

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

SOCIAL ROOTS OF THE RUSSIAN SYSTEM'S CRISIS

... page 6

Under Cover of the Dock Cleanup

... page 2

Rebecca West & Other Dinosaurs

... page 4

Jenner Flunks Out at U. of Chi.

... page 5

JULY 6, 1954

FIVE CENTS

Labor and Socialist Pickets at Russian Consulate Support E. German Workers

By SAM ADAMS

NEW YORK, June 30—Several hundred workers of this city, representing the CIO, AFL, labor, fraternal and socialist political organizations, picketed the Russian UN Delegation headquarters Monday, June 29, in a demonstration of solidarity with the workers of East Germany now engaged in a bitter struggle against their Stalinist rulers.

The picket-line demonstration, sponsored by the Workers Defense League, was endorsed by the New York City CIO Council as well as a number of important AFL unions, and many of these unions were represented on the picket line. Approximately 300 workers made up a changing line that covered both sides of the Russian UN Delegation headquarters on Park Avenue and 48 Street.

The picket-line demonstration was the outgrowth of a united-front conference called by the WDL on Tuesday, June 23. The response to the WDL conference was a good one, with the following organizations participating: Socialist Party, Independent Socialist League, Workmen's Circle, Social Democratic Federation, Jewish Labor Committee, Young Socialists (YPSL), Socialist Youth League, the Catholic Worker group, and the secretary of the Labor Committee of the Liberal Party. Norman Thomas and Christopher Emmett were present in an individual capacity and gave strong support to the conference which decided that the demonstration be called in the name of the Workers Defense League.

LABOR BACKING

The demonstration received fine support from the labor movement. A large number of unionists came as representatives of their locals, outstanding among which were UAW Local 365, Bellhops Local 144, Knitgoods Workers, and Transport Workers. Actually participating, too, were the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, UAW Local 425, IUE Local 475, Retail Employees, Pulp Workers, ACW, ILGWU, Waiters & Hotel Workers, Community & Social Agency Employees Union, United Hebrew Trades, Women's Trade Union League, as well as the CIO City Council and the Regional Office of the UAW. The organizations present at the WDL conference were strongly represented.

This fine representation from the organized labor movement of New York gave the demonstration a fine spirit and color and showed what a wonderful display of solidarity is possible in behalf of the workers of other countries fighting for their freedom and working-class rights.

The slogans of the demonstration called for the right of the East German workers to organize freely, condemned the Stalinist tyranny and executions, declared support to the struggle of the German workers now under the Stalinist heel, and demanded the release of German workers imprisoned by the regime. Singing "Solidarity" and shouting slogans throughout the march, the picket line went off very effectively.

Two trade-unionists, Joe Shane, educational director of the Knitgoods Workers (ILGWU), and Ray Sinclair, International field representative of the IUE-CIO, attempted to see the Russian delegation heads. When they were refused admittance, they pushed a picket-line leaflet under the door.

Rowland Watts said, of the picket-line:

"The WDL is proud to have been the instrument of bringing together the AFL, the CIO and independent unions in order to proclaim the solidarity of American labor with the workers of East Germany. Once more the American workers have gone on record against Stalinist tyranny. Once more the American workers have proclaimed their solidarity with all those throughout the world who struggle for freedom from oppression."

The printed leaflet issued by the Workers Defense League made the picketers' aims quite clear. Entitled "Why Are We Picketing?" the leaflet said in part:

"Because . . . The workers of East Germany have risen against the tyranny of their Stalinist oppressors, some of them paying for their part in the struggle for freedom with their lives or their liberty.

"Because . . . We of the American labor movement are united by our solidarity with the German workers, regardless of our trade union, political or religious affiliations.

"Because . . . We demand free labor unions throughout the world—in East Germany, behind the Iron Curtain, everywhere.

"We come here spontaneously, in the name of American Labor, CIO, AFL and Independent Unions. We make our protest here, before the Russian UN Delegation to let Malenkov and the Soviet rulers know that American workers are one with the German workers in their brave rebellion against Stalinist tyranny."

The Workers Defense League, its secretary, Rowland Watts, and organization secretary, Michael Harrington, who headed the Picket Committee, are to be congratulated for the initiative they took in calling this demonstration in behalf of the East German working class.

Talk Is Out in the Open in West Germany That—

West Is 'Afraid' of East German Revolt

Mass resistance to the Stalinist regime in numerous areas of East Germany went into its third week. Unconfirmed reports in a West German newspaper also described the outbreak of riots and open fights in Stalinist Poland, especially near the German border.

At the same time, there has been a political development of great interest, tending to verify the analysis presented in these columns last week on the jittery attitude of the Western powers toward the outburst of workers' struggle from below against the Russian power.

This came out in a charge made by a leader of West Germany's second-strongest bourgeois party, the Free Democratic Party. Dr. Reinhold Maier publicly asserted that the Western occupation powers, and the Adenauer government as well, were reluctant to press home the opportunities afforded by the East German workers' revolt.

"He said openly," states a N. Y. Times dispatch, "what has been whispered in West Berlin and in West Germany since the East Berlin and East German uprising: that the Western allies and the federal government [of Adenauer] were primarily concerned with taking evasive action in face of the crisis because they were

N. Y. Liberal Party To Run Independent Candidate for Mayor For the First Time

By PETER WHITNEY

For the first time in its political life, the New York Liberal Party has decided to run its own independent candidate for mayor of New York City, against both the Democrats and Republicans.

It will be Rudolph Halley, present City Council President, who two years ago gave the Liberal Party its first big independent victory when he swept into that office.

The decision, which marks a real milestone in the development of New York's labor-based "third party," was taken unanimously at a city conference on Tuesday, June 30, at the Hotel Statler. The 500 representatives of the club, county and trade-union organizations of the party enthusiastically and wholeheartedly supported Halley's nomination and pledged themselves to a vigorous campaign.

The naming of Halley is a clear victory for the overwhelming sentiment of the rank-and-file of the Liberal Party, which has unequivocally demonstrated that it wants an independent candidate this year and has turned thumbs down on any coalition with the Republicans. [See story last week—Ed.]

Although Halley calls himself an "independent Democrat" and is not formally a member of the Liberal Party, he has carried on a slam-bang campaign against the entrenched and corruption-smearing Democratic machine. Perhaps more important, since his election to the City

Council presidency, he has moved closer and closer to working in collaboration with the Liberal Party as such, as we have already reported in more detail.

The party sentiment for Halley is only partly a result of the feeling that "Halley can win" for the organization. To a very significant extent, the case is that party members' general discontent with coalitionism, and desire for independent political action, crystallized around him.

Despite this widespread feeling within the Liberal clubs, the leadership has persistently and patiently conferred with the Republicans and the Citizens Non-

(Turn to last page)

afraid to deal with it."

The dispatch continues:

"Germans in Bonn and Berlin asserted in private that, after preaching resistance for years to the peoples of Eastern Europe, 'nobody was at home' among the Western Allies and in Western Europe when the blowup occurred.

"The Germans said the Western Allies had had the moral duty to seize the initiative when the uprising occurred, but instead produced only a series of overly cautious statements and appeals to the East Germans to be prudent, and half-hearted demarches by the Western commandants of Berlin. . . .

ECHO BY DULLES

"The Germans pointed also to the action of the Western commandants restraining West Berliners from demonstrating near the border, and the six-hour delay in bringing Mayor Ernst Reuter [Social-Democratic mayor of West Berlin] back from Munich to help organize a countermove to Soviet attempts to suppress the uprising. The Germans were also aware of the fact that during the night of June 16-17 the American-controlled RIAS radio station did not receive any directives on how to

play the news."

Further indications were cited in our last week's article. There we also cited the open and clearcut expression in a Times editorial, of Western uneasiness and disquiet before the spectacle of revolutionary working-class self-movement, even though it was directed at the moment against the Stalinist power. The Times pundits stated virtually outright that the East German workers should quiet down now and wait for the U. S. to liberate them "by conquest from the outside," that is, by the third world war.

A weaker echo of this forthright expression of the capitalist mind came this week from Secretary of State Dulles, who cautioned against "an armed revolt which would precipitate a massacre." One can guess that what he is really afraid of is a sweeping upsurge of revolt which the West could not control.

The Stalinist propaganda machine is vitally interested in painting the people's revolt as inspired by "agents of Western imperialism," obviously feeling that this tie-up is calculated to make the people suspicious of anti-regime movements; but Western imperialism itself is clearly not as happy about its alleged handiwork as many people would like to believe.

Waterfront Cleanup Becomes Pretext To Hamstring the Union

By BEN HALL

The New York Legislature has just passed a bill supposedly to clean up the Port of New York. We have every reason to look with suspicion upon those who pass the bill and those who will enforce it.

The waterfront is infested with rackets dealing in simple but grand larceny, bribery, and murder, preying upon the meager wages of workers. Shipping companies pay off thousands of dollars to thugs and gangsters who worm their way into union posts. Year after year, these evils proliferate. Simple laws to handle theft and murder are overlooked while gunmen terrorize working longshoremen. Now, the same type of politician, who tolerated waterfront crime in the past, needs a special law to handle it in the future. Workers who are dogged by criminal element are now to be harried by government bureaucrats.

For many years, New York longshoremen, working under a hiring system carried down from the 18th century and wiped out in all advanced nations, did their best to defend their rights while their union was infected by the corruption of the New York waterfront. Their union was in the hands of thugs allied with the president of their union, Joseph Ryan of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL).

THE DOCKERS FOUGHT

For two and a half weeks in 1945—the war was still on—New York longshoremen struck and closed all piers in complete defiance of Ryan, who lost all control of the situation to a rank-and-file strike committee. The strike compelled a reluctant union officialdom to negotiate a 25-cent wage increase after it had already signed an agreement with the shipping association for a few cents.

In 1948 once again, spreading unofficial strikes quickly shut down all shipping on the East Coast with the demand for a wage increase of 50 cents per hour. This time, the Ryan leadership rushed to make the strike—which it did not call and did not want—very, very official. Ryan feared a repetition of the strike of three years before.

And at the end of 1951 longshoremen closed down New York piers for three and one half weeks, defying all the demands and threats of Ryan and the thugs associated with him. The strike began with demands for a wage increase but rank-and-file longshoremen quickly took up the demand for an end of gangster control over the ILA. It was this stubborn strike, coming during the Kefauver investigations, which turned the public spotlight on the situation on the New York piers. And although the strikers failed to win their demands they succeeded in bringing the plight of the New York longshoreman to the light of day.

AFL PROTESTS

It is not easy to defend union decency in an organization which is taken over by murderers but the New York longshoremen cannot be accused of passivity and defeatism. They who were victimized by a thugdom that passed as a union leadership are now very close to being hit by state laws. After lengthy investigations

and hearings, the first draft of the proposed state law and the early proposals heard along with it outlined a future of government-controlled surveillance for the longshoremen and their union.

The current law is ostensibly aimed at waterfront practices like the shape-up and public loading system, which encourage and facilitate racketeering. But behind these provisions are marshaled measures of regimentation including increasing government control over hiring.

The New York State Federation of Labor (AFL) said that this law, passed by unanimous vote of the state legislature, "infringes upon the personal liberty of every longshoreman in the Port of New York by its creation of a system of registration or licensing which is in reality regimentation of workers." And it said that provisions for registration and investigation of workers open the door to abuse giving officials the right to penalize men "under such vague and general standards as endangering the public peace, safety and welfare."

WHITEWASH

The New York longshore situation was permitted by the labor movement to deteriorate until the very existence of a genuine dock workers' union was imperilled and the rights of all waterfront unions endangered by proposed laws ostensibly designed to deal with the ILA. Despite clear signs of rank-and-file dissatisfaction with gangster control, the AFL leadership waited until public protest became too vociferous to ignore.

In August 1951, a special committee appointed by the mayor heard a report on "Labor Conditions Affecting Waterfront Commerce." It discovered the source of all trouble without difficulty: "we believe that it is inspired communist propaganda that is the cause of most of the trouble on the waterfront. We have found that the labor situation on the waterfront . . . is generally satisfactory from the standpoint of the worker, the employer, the industry, and the government."

The four labor men who signed this report were: Rayon, Joseph Curran (NLU), Joseph C. Papa, and Martin Lacey of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

But both Ryan and Papa have since discovered other sources of trouble. They are now under indictment for graft and corruption in charges arising out of the crime hearings.

Last Year, the AFL appointed a special local committee upon appeal from the despairing Ryan, to review the longshore situation. Its report was, then, a whitewash of Ryan.

DUTY FOR AFL

But in May Ryan was hit by a blow that heralded his ultimate ousting. The Executive Council of the AFL, now apparently aware of what was going on and extremely sensitive to public pressure, ordered Ryan to oust all gangsters from union posts, to end the shape-up system of hiring, and to initiate internal union reforms. (Membership meetings are almost as infrequent in the ILA as financial reports. Ryan was made "lifetime" president of the union at its 1943 convention at a salary of \$400 per week.) Ryan finally realized that he would have to retreat and tried to reach a compromise with the AFL Council that would still leave the strength of his gangster machine unimpaired. But the Council turned him down and the ILA faces expulsion by the September convention of the AFL.

As the months go by and Ryan's machine remains in power, it becomes obvious that longshoremen who want to preserve a genuine union face a critical period. What to do?

The simple duty of the AFL, whose task it is to help restore a democratic union to dock workers, is to prepare the ranks to take over their own union; to explain the issues, to call mass meetings, to encourage every sign of rank-and-file revolt against Ryan.

Thus far, however, all AFL plans seem to revolve around placing the fate of the longshoremen and their union into the hands of officials of other AFL waterfront unions.

Auto Workers

Local Elections in Auto Union Show Some Upsets for the 'Ins'

By M. J. HARDWICK

DETROIT, June 28—While any generalizations regarding the trends in local union elections in the United Auto Workers (CIO) would be highly suspect, for lack of genuine and complete facts in each specific situation, nevertheless some worthwhile events have occurred that merit reporting.

After a long pro-Reuther series of administrations, Dodge Local 3 election last week saw the defeat of every well-known Reutherite for local union offices. This includes such stalwarts as Art Grudzen, president, and Ed Zymanski, vice-president. The new administration includes such heterogeneous elements as Pat Quinn, one-time official of the Wayne County CIO Council, when it was dominated, by the old "left-wing" caucus of the UAW-CIO.

In a rather amazing but very understandable turn of events, Tracy Doll, who was kicked out of the UAW at the Milwaukee convention, was elected unopposed as president of the large Hudson local. What is worth comment is the fact that he is the only official elected at Hudson local who is pro-Reuther! His opponent, George Lucas, withdrew from the race after nominations were closed when the international union presented some interesting facts about his financial record, which caused Lucas to resign as president and to withdraw from the election.

A FEW RESULTS

It was another cause of a heterogeneous caucus running on an anti-Reuther basis winning all offices, especially after the charge was hurled in the Hudson plant that "Downtown was trying to take over by forcing Lucas to resign." It was Lucas's slate that defeated Doll's slate

for everything but the top post, which was unopposed.

The Ken Morris-Pat Caruso administration at Briggs 212 won its greatest victory in five years, sweeping all offices by as much as a three-to-one majority, and also winning by a close vote the referendum on holding officers' elections every two years.

Unlike other local union administrations which sought to ram the two-year deal down the rank-and-file throats, the Briggs 212 leadership carried on a real educational program, including presenting both sides in the local union paper.

DeSoto Local saw the incumbents lose out. Likewise in Ford Local 900, the five-year regime of Art Valente went down to defeat.

Insofar as there were races or contests in many local unions it appears that rank-and-file dissatisfaction usually expressed itself by defeats or close calls for the "ins." The big exception is the well-organized, and really the only "Reutherite" leadership in any local union, the Briggs 212 caucus, which is ably led by the Morris-Caruso leadership and works closely with Emil Mazey, UAW-CIO secretary-treasurer.

Attempts of the largely unopposed administration of Chrysler Local 7 to purge a number of independent candidates for shop-committeemen and chief stewards failed, and the administration saw its only candidate who was opposed, Ted Morgan, recording secretary, defeated by a woman, C. Smith, as a race-baiting campaign against opposition backfired, and defeated Morgan, who is a Negro.

LONDON LETTER

Britain's Stake in a Truce

By DAVID ALEXANDER

LONDON, June 22—President Syngman Rhee's unilateral action in Korea was received with extreme apprehension in Britain. Although, as Churchill put it, the United States is paying for nineteenth-century of the "blood and treasures" in the Korean war, Britain is far more seriously concerned about its outcome and early termination.

For Britain, the whole Far East is absolutely crucial in this contemporary epoch. As I have pointed out elsewhere, continuation of the war in the Far East will lead to the following imperial maladies:

- (1) Economic strangulation of Hong Kong followed by its strategic neutralization.
- (2) Loss of British trade with China, amounting to a considerable sum. This trade, incidentally, is not concerned with any strategic goods whatsoever.
- (3) Mounting aid by the Chinese for their sympathizers in Malaya, Indo-China and Burma. As regards this last country, it must be remembered that one-fifth of its total area is still controlled by non-governmental regimes. A full-scale war in Malaya would be extremely serious for Britain's economy, as destruction of rubber plantations and tin mines would deprive her of about one-fifth of her total dollar earnings.
- (4) A continued war would in time render Singapore strategically useless. In the long run this means that the communications of the empire to Australasia would be seriously threatened.

LOOKING AHEAD

These are the more obvious and historically short-term consequences of a drawn-out struggle between Britain and China in the Far East. Let us look ahead further.

If the Stalinists were to overrun Malaya, Hong Kong, Indo-China and Burma, the other countries of the Far East would be very sensitive to their appeal. India, Indonesia and Thailand could not be deaf to their overtures. China would become the leading power in Asia, and would encourage a sense of nationalism, and "Maoism" which would in the

future lead to a complete loss of trade by Britain with Asia.

I have suggested in *Vpered* that unless Britain is by then socialist, such Chinese advances in Asia would precipitate in Britain changes similar to those occurring in Rome following the fall of the Roman Empire.

Britain, as is well known, produces coal, steel, fish, manpower and the Royal Family. Within about 20 years, the last two will have been exhausted. In recent investigations I discovered to my disconcertment that the United Kingdom owes the world about \$20 billion.

The only way it can hope to pay back even part of this is by trade. If the enormous traditional markets like China, the Middle East and Africa wake up to their economic capabilities, Britain as a capitalist country is doomed to collapse.

IN THE BOOK

Although, therefore, these economic facts may sound a far cry from Rhee's unhappy exploits in Korea, they have the closest cause-and-effect relationship. Britain as a capitalist trading country cannot suffer chronic wars of attrition. To an overproductive capitalism like the United States an occasional bloodletting can have the "beneficial" effects which we see in economic high blood pressure; but for Britain a chronic war can only produce wasting.

The incontrovertible facts of capitalist economics stare Labor and Tory straight in the face. Up till now their reactions have been somewhat different. Sooner or later they must realize that only the greater efficiency implied by nationally run industry can hope to make Britain capable of running its economy without exploiting the empire. All other measures are stop-gap and short-term. They depend upon colonial peoples' being backward industrially and being kept backward.

We see that all over the world nationalism is on the order of the day. Political nationalism marches in front of economic nationalism. Together they will overrun London's City and also Wall Street. It is written in the book.

NOW—IN ENGLISH
THE FAMED "VOLUME 4"
OF "CAPITAL"

Karl Marx's
HISTORY OF
ECONOMIC
THEORIES

PART ONE

Langland Press—337 pages—\$5.00

Order from
Labor Action Book Service
114 West 14 Street, N. Y. C.

As the Man Said to the Fireman (in the Herblock Cartoon):

"We Were Just Burning a Few Books and—"

By GORDON HASKELL

Books have now become a menace to American foreign policy. And the danger stems not only from books which are considered pro-Stalinist or anti-American. Among the dangerous ones are mystery thrillers, books on anthropology, books on almost anything you might think of. The State Department admits that "about three hundred" titles have been removed from its libraries overseas, and American newspapermen claim that the number is really much greater.

First it was passports. The government stopped issuing passports not only to Stalinists but also to known anti-Stalinists whose activities abroad might be "inimical to the best interests of the United States." Among these have been pacifistic clergymen, scientists who have dabbled a bit in Stalinist politics, or who are not sure that the atom is being exploited for the very best interests of humanity.

But what good does it do to keep such "controversial" figures from going abroad and telling people their opinions of America and American policies if they can write these opinions in books which are then made available to foreigners through the public-information libraries?

No one had noticed how dangerous these books are to American world objectives till Senator McCarthy put a couple of his gunshoes on the hot trail of literary subversion. They stepped into the American library in Vienna, glanced through the card catalogue, and rushed home to announce that the shelves of American libraries are practically teeming with the works of suspect authors (such an author, of course, being anyone suspected of anything by McCarthy).

QUAKING SHOES

They returned to this country to begin calling authors before McCarthy's committee on the pretext of wanting to know why their books are on the overseas library shelves. (When they get through with their authors, we can expect that they will call others before the committee to question them on why their books are not on the overseas library shelves.) In the meantime the State Department (which has been responsible for the libraries till now) jumped to take evasive action.

Directives were rushed out demanding that all books and periodicals containing articles by known communists, subversives, "etc." be banned from the libraries. Such was the outcry from American publishers at the "vagueness" of this and subsequent directives, that to date at least six "clarifying" orders have been sent out from the State Department. The later ones have been labeled "top secret" or something of the sort, so we do not know what they contain.

But it appears that no matter how carefully they are worded, their "real intent" remains something of a mystery to the librarians in the field.

These days, it seems, when things mystify government officials they have a standard operating procedure. Those who cannot pass the buck guide themselves by their own notion of what Senator McCarthy would do if he were in their shoes. That seems to be the surest way of preventing those shoes, fully equipped with quaking occupants, from eventually standing before the senator's inquisitorial bench.

GERMANS POINT A FINGER

The Catholic Church has had centuries during which to work up its index of prohibited authors. The State Department is still a novice at the chore. And what with a few other minor matters in the world commanding the attention of its officers, it is understandable that they have so far been unable to prepare a precise list of authors whose works endanger the reputation and policy of this government when read by peoples in this and other lands. In time, this will no doubt be corrected.

The reactions abroad to the State Department's book-banning have been very alarming to well-wishers of American foreign policy. It is quite understandable that foreigners conclude that McCarthy calls the tune in American literary and cultural affairs when they see books even by authors with unquestionable anti-Stalinist records whisked off the shelves and packed up in the warehouses or consigned to the flames.

In Germany, it is reported, there has been a certain cynicism about the country which was horrified at the Nazi book-

burning orgies. And even the staunchest supporters of the pro-American policy are finding it increasingly difficult to explain to their audience of doubters that America is truly interested in defending freedom rather than something else.

A couple of weeks ago their hearts were lifted up when President Eisenhower, enveloped in a mellow mood induced by the cloistered halls of Dartmouth College, rebuked "the book burners." They were cast down again when, having been briefed by his public-relations experts, he told a press conference that of course he was not for the dissemination of outright communist propaganda, and that he had no intention of criticizing anyone in particular or in general when he referred to "book burners."

They were still further depressed when it became clear that nothing the president had said had any connection with what the State Department was continuing to do with its "controversial" books abroad, and that Dr. Robert Johnson, the man directly in charge of this cultural surgery, is of

the opinion that anyone who has refused to answer questions before a congressional committee is not fit to have his writings read abroad.

People who are genuinely concerned with the state of cultural freedom in America need not despair. There are still a lot of people in this country who have not been intimidated, and who will continue to defend the best traditions of freedom. At the moment they do not hold the positions of power which would enable them to stop McCarthy and his bully-boys or their craven accomplices in the government. In fact, they are hardly organized at all for the only really effective method of stopping McCarthyism— independent and militant political action.

But they exist, they raise their voices in protest, and in the long run they will be joined by the heavy political battalions of the American working class to smash this vile excrescence on the American body politic.

One of the clearest and most vigorous statements on book-banning was issued

by the American Library Association at its meeting in Los Angeles on June 25. The statement is so excellent that only considerations of space prevent us from reproducing it here in full. Here are some of its best paragraphs:

"The freedom to read is essential to our democracy. It is under attack. Private groups and public authorities in various parts of the country are working, to remove books from sale, to censor textbooks, to label 'controversial' books, to distribute lists of 'objectionable' books or authors, and to purge libraries.

"These actions apparently rise from a view that our national tradition of free expression is no longer valid; that censorship and suppression are needed to avoid the subversion of politics and the corruption of morals. We, as citizens devoted to the use of books and as librarians and publishers responsible for disseminating them, wish to assert the public interest in the preservation of the freedom to read.

"We are deeply concerned about these attempts at suppression. Most such attempts rest on a denial of the fundamental premise of democracy: that the ordinary citizen, by exercising his critical judgment, will accept the good and reject the bad. The censors, public and private, assume that they should determine what is good and what is bad for their fellow citizens."

LIBRARIANS' STAND

After much more along similar lines, the Library Association statement concludes with the following points specifically dealing with the attack on the overseas libraries:

"1. The libraries must express in themselves and in their services the ideas of freedom for which they speak.

"2. They must provide a service of uncompromising integrity. Their usefulness to the United States rests on the assurance of their users that they are places in which to learn the truth.

"3. The information administration must be free to use in its libraries what books soever its responsible professional judgment determines are necessary or useful to the provision of such a service. To deny itself the tools it needs to serve the United States for irrelevant reasons of the past associations of authors and in fear of domestic criticism is indefensible.

"4. Though no one could justify or would seek to justify the use of the overseas libraries to disseminate material harmful to the United States, it is unworkable to abandon the simple criterion of whether a book is useful to the purpose of the libraries and to substitute elaborate, irrelevant and offensive schemes of 'clearance' of authors.

"The American overseas libraries do not belong to a congressional committee or to the State Department. They belong to the whole American people, who are entitled to have them express their finest ideals of responsible freedom. In no other way can the libraries effectively serve their purpose, and in no other pattern can this association aid their progress."

FRANCE

Plus ça change . . .

Paris Politics-as-Usual Goes On With Its Game of Musical Chairs

By SAUL BERG

France has finally gotten a premier, but up to the naming of Laniel, the previous record number of days without a government was exceeded by far. It was over a month since the previous cabinet fell because of an adverse vote in the Chamber of Deputies on financial policies.

This last government crisis—if one can use the term crisis for something which occurs with such monotonous regularity—took place against the background of the municipal elections early in May, the first opportunity for a popular consultation since the present National Assembly was elected.

The outstanding features of those elections were the disintegration of De Gaulle's RPF and the ability of the Communist Party, despite the Marty-Tillon crisis and the shrinkage in the party membership, to retain undiminished its electoral following. With the shattering of the Gaullist RPF, the Communist Party, by retaining the allegiance of 25 per cent of the voters, became the largest party in France.

The RPF was reduced to 10 per cent of the total vote. Most of its losses were balanced by gains for the conservative Independent Party of Antoine Pinay and Paul Reynaud, but minor gains were also registered by the Radicals, the Catholic MRP and the Socialists. Thus within six short years the RPF has run its course and the authoritarian Right has had its place taken by the traditional laissez-faire Right, the Right which believes in the classical game of parliamentary horse-trading.

At first glance, these elections, it would have seemed, constituted a cause for rejoicing by the working class, and in truth this is correct insofar as the threat of a massive totalitarian political machine on the right has been removed. Unfortunately, the election results must also be taken as the definitive proof of the complete impotence of the French labor movement at the present moment.

WHY CP HOLDS ON

The RPF disappeared not because of blows dealt it by labor, but because the workers' organizations have been so feeble in their resistance to capital that the RPF had no social function to fulfill. The refusal of the RPF to play the parliamentary game was, under these circumstances, disruptive to the efforts of the bourgeois to secure some kind of harmless but stable government which would leave them free to pursue further their profitable activities of the last few years.

This only underlines the hollowness of the Stalinist electoral strength. More than ever, the entirely negative character of the French workers' "support" of Stalinism has become apparent. While party membership falls, while the party-controlled trade-union federation (the CGT) remains unable to get the workers in the plants to follow directives for action, a passive hopeless vote is cast for the CP

in the absence of any other pole of attraction that seems to offer real hope.

Meanwhile, all attempts to compose a government majority out of the present "six-sided" Assembly foundered, all during the record cabinet crisis. Allan Vaughan has already described in LABOR ACTION the effort of the left-wing "neutralist" Radical, Mendès-France, to form a cabinet based on a negotiated peace in Indo-China, a reduced arms budget, and social reforms to improve the workers' living conditions. The Stalinists voted against Mendès-France, but some 50 MRP deputies broke party discipline to vote for him. These were deputies associated with the Catholic trade unions, who have been chafing at the MRP's willingness to participate in combinations on the right, and who demand a governmental social program that will bring the Socialists back into participation in the cabinet.

If the MRP continues to divide in parliamentary votes, any cabinet on the right that is patched together must continue to have a very insecure life. However, given the paralyzing effect of the Stalinist movement on French working-class politics, the result may well be, before long, the dissolution of the Assembly and a new general election that may produce a stable right-wing majority.

Meanwhile, whatever happens in the Assembly, the workers' only real defense lies in the reconstruction of their free-trade union to the point where effective action can be undertaken, and in the even slower process of re-forging an effective socialist movement for political action.

Even Senators Can Be 'Startled'

Even after we have seen all the millionaires in Eisenhower's cabinet, and after we have seen the sort of appointments the president has made, from Charles Wilson down, one frankly stands in amazement before the disclosure on June 23 of the kind of man he picked to head the Bureau of Mines and its safety enforcement work, on which the lives of thousands of coal miners depend.

The amazement is due to the sheer effrontery of it.

Eisenhower's appointee is Tom Lyon. The man he is to replace is John Forbes, a career man who has made an enviable non-partisan record. As Lyon testified before a Senate committee, the following facts "startled" the chamber room:

• Lyon has grown gray in the service of the Anaconda Copper Mining Company, for which he has worked as an executive from 1916 to only three years ago.

• The copper mine owners are paying him a \$5000-a-year pension, which they can cut off at any time.

• This proposed enforcer of the mine safety law is against the law, thinks it should never have been passed. He considers it another part of federal control

over industry.

• This proposed protector of miners' lives, asked whether "human life doesn't come before material things," replied that "human life is becoming very cheap these days on the globe" but protested that the mine owners really do want to avoid accidents because "every time we have an accident it costs money."

• This proposed representative of Uncle Sam's tender care for workers' lives asserted that 99 per cent of all mining accidents were the fault of "individual miners."

It is John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, who has been raising a ruckus over the naming of Lyons.

Defending his right to take a pension from the mine owners while responsibility for the safety laws, Lyons commented: "You can't take these government jobs if you don't have outside income." As head of the mine bureau, he would get only \$14,800 a year.

This isn't Lyons' first government job. In 1951 Truman made him deputy chief of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency.

On Rebecca West and Other Dinosaurs

Reviewing a Bit of Surrealist Fiction on McCarthyism and the CP

By JAMES M. FENWICK

In his appearance before congressional committees Charles E. Wilson, the secretary for defense, evokes the same sort of fascination produced by the prehistoric monsters in a museum of natural history. Indeed, across the millenia, dinosaur calls unto dinosaur.

For the conclusion becomes more and more inescapable that if Wilson is a representative sample of our native capitalist class the rudimentary cranial capacity and hulking structure of that class obviously precludes its making any serious change to meet the changing world environment. It is lumbering along a tortuous path marked with a sign reading: This Way to Extinction.

Basking happily up to his eyes in the primal political ooze of the recent air force budget hearings in Washington, Wilson gave out with one of his homely observations on existential matters.

According to the *New York Times*, "Mr. Wilson commented that 'the scientists talk a lot about pure research' and recalled that Charles F. Kettering, former official of General Motors, had his own definition for pure science: if successful, it could not be of any possible use to the people who put up the money for it—that made it pure.

"I am not interested, as a military project, in why potatoes turn brown when they are fried," Mr. Wilson added."

In view of such total crassness in high office it is easy to understand why it would not necessarily take much more for an Einstein to recommend that United States intellectuals not testify at all before congressional loyalty committees.

The crudities of Wilson serve to emphasize once more the intellectual barrenness of American bourgeois leaders—theoretical and practical alike—before the Stalinist phenomenon. To read even George F. Kennan, one of the most highly touted of them, is to realize how ignorant and how sterile they are.

In attacking Marxism or Stalinism on any sort of literate level the United States bourgeoisie depends exceptionally heavily, if not exclusively, on imported talent. In economics it can be a John Maynard Keynes, in sociology a Max Weber, in religion a Paul Tillich.

SPOILS-SYSTEM THEORY

This is true of one of the most recent persons to be so employed — Rebecca West, the English novelist and, in recent years, the intuitive specialist on the subject of treason.

It was she who recently undertook to explain and defend the phenomenon of McCarthyism before an English audience in a series of articles published in the *London Times*.

The *U. S. News and World Report*, which normally not unrealistically analyzes the news from a businessman's point of view, evidently found this approach so stimulating in view of the bad press which McCarthy has received in the United States—and even worse ones which he has received in Europe—that it reprinted the articles in their fatuous and exclusive entirety in its May 22 issue.

West's explanation of the drive against the Stalinists in the United States is totally unique. "But we can see clearly what was in the minds of the committees. What

they feared was a reintroduction of the spoils system into the federal Civil Service in a new form. Before the passage of the Pendleton Act the party in the majority, whether Republican or Democrat, distributed public offices as rewards to its supporters. . . . There has . . . sprung up a new spoils system organized by the Communist Party."

Only a person with a vague remembrance of Bryce's *The American Commonwealth*, and oriented by English upper-middle-class prejudice, a keen eye for the dollar area, complete ignorance of world political reality, and an overblown prose style could arrive at that conclusion.

It is a conclusion which is not at all convincing even in terms of her own descriptions of government personnel involved in espionage for the Russians.

It is obvious, for example, that a Harry Dexter White, the former government economist, who represented the United States at Bretton Woods and enjoyed "a special tie of friendship with Lord Keynes," and enjoyed "not less a close tie with Léon Blum," would easily have gone places in his own right without the special facilities offered by a Stalinist clique in the government.

DEFENDING MCCARTHY

Her complete inability to see any of these men as actuated in any significant manner by a revulsion against the historic anachronism of capitalism—even if it is a misguided revulsion—tells us a great deal about her lack of sympathy for the human condition of the masses but little about Alger Hiss and his co-workers whose motivations she is trying to explain.

It would be interesting to see the explanation given by West for the espionage engaged in by the Rosenbergs, who were not in government service and who lived in modest circumstances.

Nor would it be without interest to see West apply her theory to countries like France and Italy, where Stalinism is a mass phenomenon.

Or to see her apply it to the Korean war which began in 1950 when North Korean tanks crossed the 38th parallel under the slogan, "Down with the Pendleton Act!"

A world struggle between a dying capitalist order and a sprawling bureaucratic

collectivist society, of which the witch-hunting in the United States is an integral part, does not seem to exist for her.

Since according to West it is clean government which is at stake, it is not too difficult for her to defend Senator Joe McCarthy. It is a somewhat equivocal defense, but a defense nevertheless.

McCarthy is a demagogue? Probably. But look at the trouble the government went to (six days of committee hearings) in investigating American aspects of the assassination of Trotsky! "Surely," she concludes with air-tight logic, "it is not rash to take these facts as indicating that the United States has other troubles to worry about than the demagogic qualities of Senator McCarthy."

True, he is a boor, but "it would seem indeed as if not all the vices in the United States were on the side of Senator McCarthy." McCarthy, for example, did not attempt to kill Walter Reuther in the kitchen of his home as did the Stalinists—a fact heretofore apparently the private property of Rebecca West, since to our knowledge nothing of this sort was ever established.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Of course, West has a great deal of more reliable information than the Reuther story, most of it gained from reports of government investigating committees. The story of the workmanlike job of penetration into government agencies by the Stalinists is a familiar one.

Needless to say, she shows no understanding that the job of infiltration was facilitated not only by the political naiveté of the capitalist politicians but by the political education of the Stalinists as well.

Not so recognizable is the treatment she gives of other aspects of current conditions in the United States. As in a surrealist painting, specific features are identifiable but in no real world context that we are aware of.

For West, contentedly ruminating in the rural peace of her dairy farm in England, there is no danger to academic freedom in the United States.

Of the belief that such a danger is real and present she says, "This account of the United States has the slick coherence of a Goebbels lie, the stereotyped character of Muscovite invective."

Actually, she states, the real danger comes from the Stalinists. This latter point is based on the sole testimony of a Harry Albaum, a professor of biology at Brooklyn College who testified that he was too terrorized to quit the Communist Party when he wanted to.

Of the score upon score of concrete statements by educators decrying the effect of the current atmosphere upon the freedom to teach, Rebecca West has not

a word to say. And anyone with the slightest contact with the professoriat knows just how much worse the actual situation is in comparison with the printed statements.

Nor, on a broader field, does Rebecca West have a word to say about the attorney general's list of alleged subversive organizations. Organizations were arbitrarily placed on this list by administrative order for reasons unavailable to members of those organizations. There is, to date, no known method of getting off the list.

THE BOURGEOIS MIND

In the contortions she goes through in exculpating Senator McCarthy she does make one point which is worth recalling again and again to those liberals who see the whole difficulty as being one of "McCarthyism."

The whole witchhunt atmosphere, which has now reached the point that Whittaker Chambers' *Witness* is being jerked from governmental overseas libraries and Mark Twain's works are cleared for inclusion, began long before the advent of McCarthy upon the scene with his bundle of political faggots.

It began specifically during the Roosevelt administration with the Smith Act under which eighteen Trotskyists were sent to jail early in World War II.

It is the product of a United States capitalism in a world environment of capitalist decline menaced by the spread of Stalinism.

It is systemic, not accidental.

West concludes by stating, "The Communist Party offers its members secret advantages over their neighbors on condition that they serve the interests of the Soviet Union."

"The reports of the committees show that these advantages take many forms, but the most common is the jobbery of posts in the civil service and office in the trade unions. And the bribetaking is rendered morally painless, and becomes indeed the source of a beatification, since there is a pretense that the bribetakers are involved in these proceedings only because they are noble souls anxious to free the downtrodden workers."

It is a depressing dévotion for a one-time Fabian, feminist, admirer of Ibsen, and a not unstimulating book reviewer for the *New Statesman and Nation*.

It is the simple-minded conclusion of a person so steeped in the mores of bourgeois society that she can explain phenomena only in terms of the "cash nexus" which Marx in the *Manifesto* noted as the dominant moral tie in capitalist society.

It is a simplemindedness exceeded only by its guaranteed ineffectiveness in combating the growth of Stalinism.

BOLIVIA

Trotskyist POR's New Line—

Bolivian 'Left' Goes Along with Regime

By JUAN REY

SANTIAGO, June 22—The last attempt to upset the Nationalist-MNR government in Bolivia was participated in by officers of the police and military forces, under the leadership of the "Falange Socialista," a totalitarian and pro-Franco organization. It revealed the internal contradictions of the country and the growing political opposition to the regime.

After more than a year of political power, the government of Paz Estenssoro faces a very serious economic situation. The country is on the edge of economic chaos. The nationalization of mines, as carried through by the government, did not solve the problems of "economic emancipation" as promised by the Nationalists.

On the contrary, it increased difficulties. The state bureaucracy is incapable of efficiently administering the mines, and therefore the situation of the workers became worse than it was under private enterprise, both in respect to wages and conditions. The state has not been able to sell its tin to the United States, yet it must continue to pay wages and maintain production.

The government, consequently, had recourse to inflation in order to pay the mine workers' wages. The dollar scarcity that resulted from the inability to sell

the tin to the U. S. threatened the provision of the country with food and other necessities.

In this situation the government adopted "heroic means": it devalued the currency from 60-100 to the dollar to 225, etc. With this, the price of bread, meat, sugar and other foods rose more than 100 per cent. The wage raises which were decreed were absolutely inadequate to make up for the devaluation of the currency; the inflation took place at the expense of the workers and middle class.

This new economic policy of the Nationalist government was pro-capitalist and represented a turn to the right and the end of the period of romantic "revolutionary" phraseology.

COB TRANSFORMED

Of course, in addition, a good part of the economic difficulties stem from typical South American corruption: advantages for the personal affairs of govern-

ment and MNR party leaders, etc. In the midst of the general crisis and chaos, new fortunes and newly rich men are arising.

But in spite of this situation the Nationalist regime has not lost the support of the majority of the workers and peasants. Among the workers the decisive sector is that held by the workers' unions, which are controlled by the Nationalist machine. First place here is held by the workers' bureaucracy led by Lechin.

The *Central Obrera Boliviana*, the trade-union federation, has been transformed from a revolutionary organ into a bureaucratic committee. It controls the working-class movement, subordinates it to government policy and blocks any strike or independent political action on the part of the workers. The labor bureaucracy have good positions in the mine administration of the ministries, and so they are very zealously in favor of maintaining the Nationalist regime; in this way they maintain their own privileges. Thus there has been created a very strong political and social machine which stands over the working-class and peasant movement and subordinates it to the government.

A big role in this process was played by the "leftist" parties, not only the Stalinists, but also the POR (the Trotskyist party) which is very strong in Bolivia.

(Turn to last page)



LABOR ACTION

July 6, 1953

Vol. 17, No. 27

Published weekly by Labor Action Publishing Company, 114 West 14 Street, New York 11, N. Y.—Telephone: WAtkins 4-4222—Re-entered as second-class matter May 24, 1940, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1874.—Subscriptions: \$2 a year; \$1 for 3 months (\$2.25 and \$1.15 for Canadian and Foreign).—Opinions and policies expressed in signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent the views of Labor Action, which are given in editorial statements.

Editor: HAL DRAPER. Asst. Editors: MARY BELL, BEN HALL, GORDON MASKELL. Bus. Mgr.: L. G. SMITH

What Are the Social Roots of the

By HAL DRAPER

The Great Relaxation in Russia, which followed hard on the death of Stalin, is an event of major importance from the point of view of its effect on all international politics, but it also challenges interpretation as a major event from another angle: What does it indicate about the internal dynamics of the Stalinist system?—its laws of motion, if a more grandiose term is desired.

It has indubitably pointed to conflicts inside the Russian bureaucratic ruling class; but this idea has been interpreted in an extremely — and peculiarly "American"—narrow sense by commentators, analysts and assorted "Russian experts." That is, the idea of conflicts inside the ruling class is too often equated with the idea of conflicts inside the Kremlin, that is, among the top dictators of the ruling class. But these two are plainly not the same thing.

A discussion of a battle for power among the Malenkovs, Berias, Molotovs, Khrushchevs and other top-level masters, whether or not accompanied by schemas of bureaucratic factional alliances, is surely a possible contribution to the general question; and it would be a very good thing if any of our experts could manage to work out a hypothetical construction on this intriguing problem which would hold water for more than a couple of weeks. But more often than not, the focus of attention is not really on the top-level struggle as part of a conflict within a ruling class, but on this struggle as one merely between individual aspirants for personal power, in a context which is not differentiated too sharply from similar power contests in the kind of bureaucratic political machines with which we are familiar under capitalism.

On this approach we had a number of things to say in the very first article in LABOR ACTION after the death of Stalin (March 18); it would be useful to repeat it here, *in toto*, though we shall not.

Here we wish to put the spotlight on the internal dynamics of the CLASS of which the Kremlin dictators are the leaders. The internal conflict to be discussed here is not within the Kremlin but typically between the Kremlin group and the ranks of that class.

Just as this is not set in opposition to any analysis of personal battles for power within the Kremlin, which no doubt exist, so it is also not set in opposition to the other extremely important question of the conflicts and antagonisms between the bureaucratic class and the mass of exploited workers and peasants.

Crisis of the System

There are, then, three levels of conflict that demand attention: inside the Kremlin top circles of the ruling class; inside the ruling class as a whole; and between the ruling bureaucracy and the masses of people. We are concerned here with the second.

Merely to define this second area of interest is, almost automatically, to raise all the basic problems of the laws of motion of Stalinist bureaucratic collectivism as a social system. It can hardly be discussed without doing so; this is the very first way in which it differs from the more usual speculation over the first and third areas of conflict.

It raises the problem of looking at the post-Stalin crisis as a crisis of the social system, and not merely as a crisis of personal power or as a manifestation of the class struggle.

We shall begin by briefly pointing to the contradiction which lies at the basis of the chronic crisis of this social system. We shall argue that this crisis, while it was not created by Stalin's death, was rendered acute and opened up wide as a result of Stalin's death.

We shall point out that, especially in the year that preceded Stalin's death, the regime had embarked on a high-voltage campaign directed toward solving this crisis with certain methods and in a certain direction, after there had been long debates, disputes and cross-pulls. This was the theme and focus of the 19th Party Congress last October, the congress at which Malenkov stepped forward as the heir-apparent of the boss. It was the central theme of much of the discussion material in the Russian press which preceded the 19th congress; it was the point hammered away at in the press after the congress.

The regime was in full swing along the lines of this campaign to solve its besetting chronic crisis; when No. 1 died—and all the cards in the deck flew up in the air.

Fundamental Starting Point

The chronic crisis of the Stalinist social system of bureaucratic collectivism is, fundamentally, due to its basic inherent contradiction: the contradiction between totalitarianism and economic planning.

This idea has lately been given special attention in the columns of LABOR ACTION. It is also our starting point here. This much is necessary as a reminder:

(1) This Stalinist society, in our view, is a new type of exploitive social system, which has nothing in common with socialism and which is antagonistic to the old system of capitalism. Its basis is a completely stratified economy. The state owns all the means of production, but who "owns" the state? Not the people, as in a socialist democracy. This state—which-owns-everything is itself "owned" and controlled by a totalitarian bureaucracy, the new ruling class.

This society is organized as a bureaucratic pyramid, operating from the top down; it is a society in which the totalitarian purge system implemented by the GPU

The accompanying article is substantially based on a lecture given at various meetings in the month of May. I had hoped to get the time to develop the theme further and with more detailed references to the discussions that surrounded the 19th party congress of the Russian Communist Party; but since this has proved impossible so far, it is perhaps well to set it down in its present form, which is that of a suggestive hypothesis on the very complex question it raises. Unlike a number of "Russian experts", who have been giving us the final low-down on the Kremlin crisis, I am not of the opinion that it is The Explanation, but I think it suggests an approach to the social roots of the Russian crisis which merits further investigation.
—H. D.

is not a conjunctural method but an inherent characteristic of the system.

In this society where the state (the political institution of society) is the direct master of the economic institutions of the society, politics and economics are fused. The totalitarian system which is the political regime is also the economic regime. Totalitarianism characterizes not only the relations between the ruling class and the oppressed classes; it also characterizes the relationships inside the ruling class, among the hierarchical layers of its composition from top to bottom.

(2) Under capitalism, that which regulates and orders the economic system is the capitalist market and its laws, not conscious planning. In the unplanned and basically anarchic system of capitalism, it is this "blind" behind-the-scenes regulator of the economy which acts as its impersonal "planner," which is supposed to overcome disproportions in the economy, which governs the relationships inside the capitalist class also.

The capitalist market as the regulator and governor of the economy does not exist under the Stalinist system. There is something else which performs this function as the regulator of the system. In any completely stratified system there is only one thing which can do so. That is conscious planning.

The Stalinist society must be planned, or else it must be chaos. But like everything else under its totalitarian structure, the economic planning of the system is devised from above, bureaucratically; it is bureaucratically imposed from above; it is bureaucratically enforced from above; it is bureaucratically checked from above; it is bureaucratically modified and adapted from above.

But no bureaucratic commission can itself really plan the labyrinth of economic and social processes which go on in the modern complex industrial society. The framework of a plan must be constantly checked from below, corrected from below. For its live adaptation, it must depend on initiative and responsibility from below. It must be self-correcting through the give-and-take of democratic planning between the upper and lower echelons on every level.

This is exactly what is impossible under Stalinist planning.

The 'Planned Muddle'

It is this which gives rise to the "planned muddle" of Stalinist economy, and to the unending, continual series of fantastic snarls, snafus, breakdowns, botches and disproportions which characterize it. What must be realized about the Stalinist economy is the scale on which this takes place. Our readers lately got an idea of this from the excellent article by Robert Loukota on the Stalinist economy in Czechoslovakia; for a descriptive presentation of the situation we recently recommended the book by Zavalani, *How Strong is Russia?* Kravchenko's *I Chose Freedom* had a good section, describing his experiences as a factory manager. For a concentrated summary of this chronic crisis from the point of view of the factory manager (i.e., the lower echelons of the bureaucracy), we have recommended an article in the February 1953 issue of *Fortune* magazine.

The factory manager must meet his monthly production quota—but how, if he does not have the manpower that has been "planned" on paper, if he does not have the raw materials that have been "planned" for his receipt, or if they are unusable on receipt? etc. The regime, cracking the whip on top, demands performance. Mistakes are sabotage. Failure is disloyalty. Fear and suspicion are the rule. Every decision to be made is a trap, especially if it involves judgment or initiative. What is the reality behind the fact, which the Russian press's laments show to be the rule, that factory quotas are most often met by "storming tactics" in the last week or so of the month? If the quota is a million screws, they have to be produced, even if eventually they will not fit the machine for which they are intended—but that is another plant's lookout. Hence the constant drive from above for "quality" in production. We have not even scratched the surface with these hints.

Escape-Valve

In fact, the question that inevitably arises in the mind of anyone who gets a full view of this picture especially from the Russian sources is: How does this economy manage to work at all?

It is true that Russia's production is dependent to a large extent on enormous expenditures of human labor power and resources, including masses of slave labor, and on the most intense rate of labor exploitation in the world. It is also true that, with the victory in the war, Russia's looting and robbing of the satellites un-

doubtedly gave its economy a substantial lift. But these are auxiliary in the sense that they help to account for the high level of production but not for the way in which the productive system manages to muddle through at all. What makes the "planned muddle" work?

For this, one has to look down into the hierarchy of the ruling bureaucracy, to those strata of it which are in direct contact with the problem, typified by the factory managers.

To keep production going, these lower echelons of the bureaucracy have to constantly seek to ESCAPE from the straitjacket of the bureaucratic Plan.

From this arises the notorious system of *blat*, the Russian term which sums up all the ways to which the factory managers have recourse in order to get their production quotas out in spite of everything. Labor is piratically snagged from other plants—in this economy which has to be planned. Influence with the local party secretary can get a shipment of raw materials sidetracked from another factory—in this economy which has to be planned. Winter clothes will be produced for summer wear, if that is possible when the proper materials cannot be gotten—and *Pravda* then writes incredible articles about the spectacle showing in Moscow shop windows. "Pushers" are employed by the factory managers to do what the "plan" is supposed to do, namely, bring the factors of production together, but on an anarchic individual basis. Again, the full picture can hardly be gathered from these examples, but they are illustrative.

No Escape on Top

This escape from the Plan, getting around the Plan, is an individual escape for the lower-echelon bureaucrat. But from the point of view of the system as a whole, it obviously and inevitably only snarls things up further.

The factory manager does not engage in these practices because he is antagonistic to planning; he does it because he has to, to save his own neck. The top bureaucrat, denouncing "indiscipline in the Plan" as the greatest evil, knows full well that it goes on and must go on but he hopes it can be kept under control, whereas on the contrary it must snowball.

On the level of the economy as a whole, this mode of escape for the factory manager appears in the eyes of the top bureaucracy as a prime danger, a consuming creeping evil, which bears within itself the menace of mounting disproportions in the economy, complete breakdown of the only thing which regulates and governs the economy, the Plan.

Within this mode of production polar tendencies are set up: the tendency of the lower echelons of the bureaucracy to make their individual "plans" conform with reality, at the expense of the social Plan as a whole; and the need of the top bureaucracy to whip the lower echelons into line with the Plan.

Hence the problem of controls within the ruling bureaucracy, leaving quite outside of our purview the whole question of the controls over the masses who lie outside all sections of the ruling class.

What is set up is a tug-of-war between the tops and the lower echelons inside the bureaucracy, a tug-of-war in which one side pulls to evade the controls from above, and the other side pulls back to keep the administrative bureaucracy on the ground of the Plan.

What are the solutions for the top bureaucracy? There has been more than one pushed at different times. Let us take a quick look at three, and then at the one around which the 19th Party Congress focussed.

(1) The problem is evasion of controls down below? Then, more controls for them! That is, more bureaucratic controls from on top.—But it is as plain as day that this only intensifies the basic evil of bureaucratized planning—gasoline on the fire.

(2) Splitting up of bureaucratic controls, as for example in the new Czech system described by Robert Loukota, where, to counter one evil, factory management was in effect split between the manager and the chief accountant, to avoid rigging by either. It cannot work.

(3) Long before now, the Stalinist regime understood that the remedy must be sought in some form of control from below, as stands to reason. Only—it is just this which is impossible for them. Thus, it has long been the practice for the regime to call on all good and loyal workers to report all cases of "plan indiscipline," corruption, botches, mistakes that have been covered over, etc. in letters to the press and authorities—economic stoolpigeonry. We need not examine how this in practice functions in quite another manner—as a mechanism for purging selected victims, for example—but not as any real live check from below on behalf of the Plan.

Malenkov Complains

The solution to this crisis which was raised to a campaign at the 19th Party Congress was another variant: not more bureaucratic controls from the top (at least in form); not more calls for check from below by workers; but, so to speak, check from the side: the supervision and check over the economic organizations by the parallel party organizations in the area or field. Bring the party units to bear on the lower echelons of the bureaucracy!—this was the battlecry of the 19th congress, not entirely new in itself of course, but raised to a new desperate pitch.

The most important thing about the 19th congress theme was not the particular form it took, as described above; the important thing was the fact that the congress sought to bring the whole strength of the party to bear to crack the whip over the lower ranks of the bureaucracy, to pull it into line in the tug-of-war.

'Relaxation' Crisis in the Kremlin?

For the chronic crisis of the economic regime had been steadily mounting since the end of the world war.

It is true that the situation is a continuing one, inherent in the system at all times. But during the war there had been a change in the relationship of forces in the tug-of-war. The eyes, strength, attention and resources of the regime were strained to fight an external foe in a desperate fight for life. It is possible to show that, with respect to the question of intra-bureaucratic control that we have been discussing, there had to be and was a substantial loosening up. With the end of the war, the regime started to try to swing the helm back the other way.

The report by Malenkov to the 19th Party Congress, in its sections which obviously deal with this problem, is general, gingerly worded, carefully vague in its formulation, but not too Aesopian to be understood. He leaves absolutely no doubt that he is discussing how to counter a trend that raised its head fearfully in the post-war period. Thus, for example (our emphasis):

"Strengthening of the party bodies, improving their activity and intensifying the work of the party organizations acquired a special significance in the post-war period. . . . The fact of the matter is that wartime conditions had necessitated certain specific methods of party leadership and had given rise to serious shortcomings in the work of the party bodies and party organizations. . . . There was a certain danger of the party bodies losing contact with the masses, and that . . . they would turn into something in the nature of administrative-management offices incapable of countering the sundry local, narrow-departmental and other anti-state tendencies, and failing to notice outright distortions of the party's policy in economic upbuilding and violations of state interests."

"The fact of the matter is," he says that since the conclusion of the war, "Facts show that the successes have engendered in the ranks of the party sentiments of complacency, ostentation, and philistine smugness, a desire to rest on one's laurels and live on past services. No small number of functionaries have appeared who believe that 'everything is easy,' a walkover, that 'all is well' and that there is no need to indulge in so unpleasant a task as disclosing shortcomings and mistakes in the work, or combating negative and unhealthy practices in our organizations."

He denounces the bureaucrats "who place their personal tranquility" above the state's injunctions. He denounces others who try to turn their enterprises "into their own private domains" where they can do whatever they wish.

It is the top bureaucracy rallying its forces in the tug-of-war with the ranks of the functionaries.

What The Bureaucracy Wants

It is the latter poor devils who are in the middle of the "planned muddle." They see themselves hemmed in on all sides, in the exercise of their job, by the straitjacket controls imposed by a regime which sees sabotage and disloyalty all about it.

They feel themselves buffeted between reality and the Plan, tied down by the impossible controls from the top by the top. They have no "freedom" to do their job. It is not political freedom that is involved for them; they accept the lack of it, and understand as well as the tops what political freedom would mean for their system.

But to the economic controllers on top, they cry, "Leave us alone and we'll get a job done. . . . Don't press us so hard! . . . Stop pushing, you only get in the way!" To the tops, this appears, and with some justice, as a "local, narrow departmental" viewpoint, a "desire to rest," "smugness," false cries that "all is well" and we don't need any more controls, a base yearning for "personal tranquility." This is what Malenkov is virtually quoting.

And indeed they have a "desire to rest." We are used to thinking quite truly in terms of the hard lot of the Russian working class, but the fact is that there is not a ruling class in the world which is as hard-driven as that in this Stalinist bureaucratic-collectivist society. They have arrived at posts of relative privilege and standing? Yes, and they have to maintain it at a cost which, in its own way, is a driving strain greater even than that of the workers in their factories.

They have risen in the world, these new bureaucrats, and they have an understandable desire to enjoy some fruits of their success. If they assure the regime that "everything is easy," as Malenkov notes, they mean "We want to take it easy," that is, easier. They want to relax, to enjoy life, in this regime which exists by straining, girding, whipping, driving and pushing to their utmost not only the masses but, as the intermediary transmission belt to the masses, its own ranks of bureaucrats and functionaries.

The controls and whips against which they tug are the controls of the Plan and of the machinery geared from the top to enforce "discipline of the plan." And the tops know that this relaxation which the ranks of the class yearn for means economic anarchy, literally.

The 19th Party Congress, and as usual even more specifically the press "discussion" which preceded it, was the setting for the regime's post-war effort to rally against these disintegrative tendencies. This first party congress since the end of the war was not convened until the regime was ready to marshal its strength in this contest.

The New Generation

There is another angle from which to approach this same situation, taking off from a phenomenon which has been much remarked.

This bureaucracy of which we speak, in its many-millioned ranks, is a new generation of bureaucrats. It is one that has been shaped under Stalinism, and has developed to conscious participation only under this system.

Stalin and the Stalinist counter-revolution came to power against the Bolsheviks with a different generation, different cadres. They were going to "build socialism" in their own way—in one country—on a nationalistic basis, by force and terror; but what we wish to stress is that they were going to build socialism.

This generation, in its own way, counter-revolutionary as it was, had a certain "idealism." This Stalinism was transitional: it did not consider itself an end in itself and it could not remain where it was. For it, the Stalinist society which it was building was not the end of a road but a means. They saw this "socialism" of theirs in deadly conflict with the capitalist world, only one of which could survive, precisely because they thought of it as "socialism." They had a historical view of themselves, a mission. For this mission the whole society had to be girded and driven even as they drove themselves; dedicated; yes, sacrificing; for the alternative was ruin and defeat.

Such is not this generation of the bureaucracy.

Now we have the "Soviet men," as they have been vaguely distinguished. For them, this society is IT. It is not a road to "something else," it is theirs and it could be good, and above all it is what they know.

They could enjoy it like any other ruling class, if just allowed to do so. They want to be a ruling class like any other ruling class—not like any other capitalist ruling class, to be sure, but like any other ruling class which enjoys the fruits of its exploitation. They want a state like any other state, in the same sense; and to hell with this driving mission for the future, which has approximately the same meaning for them as Thomas Jefferson's remarks about watering the tree of liberty with blood every so often has for the average American.*

Rest, relax, let up, stop pushing, let us enjoy our bureaucratic life—this is what the guns of the 19th congress thundered away at. In this picture which we are suggesting, the conflict inside the Russian ruling class is a conflict between the men on top and the hierarchy of functionaries below them. This is the tug-of-war which we have been picturing.

Peace, in Two Senses

In this kind of conflict are involved all the questions of policy of the regime. But of all the problems of policy, which are raised, one of the most immediate is that of foreign policy, war and peace.

We would suggest at this point that it is out of this pull toward relaxation in the ranks of the bureaucracy that there arises the "mass" basis, within the ruling class, for a most powerful cry for an easing of the cold war. They want an easement of the internal relations; but an international easement is a prerequisite. They want to regularize their status internally; but for this they have to regularize foreign relations. They want to relax internally; but for this a relaxation of the external strain is a necessity.

For the older Stalinist generation, "peaceful coexistence" may be a matter of demagogy. For this new bureaucratic mass, "peaceful coexistence" is a yearning that arises out of their class relationships.

Perhaps, if some of our Russian experts who draw up schemes of factional lineups are right, Zhdanov had wanted a militant anti-capitalist policy in world politics. These, however, say: "So what if capitalism is shaky and this is the time to push it, as you claim? Let it shake, let it fall, as we are told is inevitable anyway, but that's not our mission—away with missions! Let up all around, so that you can let up on us!"

Transmission Belt

There is another angle of approach. We have been concentrating on the intra-class relationships between the lower bureaucracy and the tops of the party hierarchy. But precisely because the former is "lower," it is in the middle between the party hierarchy and the masses. It is they who have to drive the workers as they themselves are driven; but the whip is no automatic solution, contrary to the opinion of so many who are awed by totalitarianism as much as they hate it, as in a form of devil-worship.

In spite of the whip, a "cold" class struggle goes on, in the elementary form of absenteeism, malingering, indifference to the job ("sabotage"), indifference to quality, low productiveness, etc. The factory manager is bedeviled by the fact that the workers have the least of inducements to give their all for him. It is known that these lower bureaucrats even go so far as to offer bribes and inducements to snatch labor from other

*The discussion at this point does not necessarily imply that this new-generation bureaucracy is homogeneous. It should be taken as describing the dominant trend in it. From one section of Stalin's last work, *Economic Problems of Socialism*, a polemic against one Yaroshenko, it has been argued that Stalin is attacking an equalitarian tendency among the new generation. Nothing above is intended to gainsay that. Starting from the same situation, rising young stars of the bureaucracy can go off in diametrically opposite directions: They read The Books and find in them the opposite of Russian reality; they raise questions; they want to call in, as due, the promissory notes issued in the past, by Stalin's generation. But this takes us outside the scope of intra-class bureaucratic relationships as such, to which this article is limited.

plants when hard-pressed. In a different sense from the working masses, the factory manager also wishes that it were possible to offer them greater inducements to produce at their peak—more consumption goods, more crumbs from the table, concessions.

In this way, side by side with their function as the tyrannical whips and oppressors of the regime, and not at all in contradiction with it, the inevitable tendency must also arise, out of their own immediate interests, for the lower bureaucrats to act as transmitting belts for the needs of the people. "If they got a crust more, they would work harder, and some of our problems would be eased. If prices were lowered, they would be less difficult."

The pressure from below is transmitted through these lower sections of the bureaucratic class. This factor, contributed by the pressure of the class antagonisms, enters into the matrix of the relationships inside the ruling class. The lower bureaucracy wants concessions to itself; but concessions to the workers becomes a part of its implicit "program" also.

The Role of Stalin's Death

We have repeatedly called this intra-class conflict a "tug-of-war." The metaphor makes clear why it was that the death of Stalin could and did intervene in this situation with explosive effect.

In a different kind of society, the death of one man, even the most powerful man in the land, would not have had as fundamental and far-reaching an impact. In the conflict we have tried to describe, its impact cannot be overestimated.

Picture this tug-of-war: on one side of the rope, the Kremlin gang around Stalin; on the other side, the lower echelons of the bureaucracy. (It does not matter if this picture is oversimplified, as it certainly is; it is the over-all pattern we want to stress.) For seven years since the end of the war, the former have been girding for a major effort on the rope, represented by the 19th congress. The big pull begins; the country resounds with its cries and slogans for months. The whole force of the party hierarchy is grouped around the Mighty Right Hand, which has concentrated all the power of the hierarchy in itself.

In the midst of this all-out pull, the strong arm of the boss falls.

We know the situation in general that followed: a big weakening of power in the Kremlin, "disarray," a vacuum.

In our tug-of-war, the rope can go only one way.

In political terms, the regime is pulled toward the "program" which arises out of the class position of the lower ranks of the new-generation bureaucracy.

These feel their oats. They can be more demanding, more self-confident, if only temporarily. They must be more tenderly regarded by all contenders for the top power. Facing them, and in no position for a crackdown, is the new directorate in the Kremlin, bereft of Stalin, besieged by strains, unconsolidated, shaky, perhaps wanting to travel Stalin's path but unable to do so without detours at least.

Classic Pattern

We have been discussing up to now as if the top circles in the Kremlin were or are a homogeneous group as against the rest of the bureaucracy, in the face of the class problem. But it would be unprecedented if this were entirely so, even before the death of Stalin, even granting that the tops have to be unitedly aware of the danger from below. For there are different ways of meeting a danger: concessions, the club, or any combination thereof, in any admixture of a "hard" or "soft" line.

Even more true is this of the new directorate without Stalin.

A classic pattern asserts itself. Cracks have appeared on top, the tops are visibly weakened. Dangerous forces down below are encouraged, stimulated to widen the crack. There is always the threat that through the cracks, the struggle from below will pour through. How shall it be met?

The classic dilemma of hard-or-soft confronted the new masters too. We cannot crack down, not yet, but how much shall we give way? If we give too much, that may be very effective in appeasing the animals—or will it just encourage them to grab for our arm too? How far can we go in relaxation, and get away with it? How far can we go in relaxation on this and that, while still unmistakably warning, "So far and no further!"

Anyone who wishes may proceed to tie up the names of given Presidium bosses with the "hards" or "softs." That is a different game, and very popular. What is more important is that a strong social pull from below will tend to find its "representatives" on top, even if only in the form of a "soft" opponent rather than a "hard" one. In the last analysis, even personal-power battles in the Kremlin cannot be divorced from the social issues that arise from below.

But there is one big difference between a conflict in the Kremlin which is simply a personal-power battle, and a conflict which is rooted in the chronic crisis of the system. The former can find a solution; the latter cannot.

In the former case the Russian crisis can be resolved if Malenkov crunches his boot over Beria, or vice-versa, or the same with any suitable change of names required by a given speculation. The Kremlin crisis is then over.

But for the crisis which we have described, there is no final solution. It will go on, in a hundred forms, until the regime is overthrown.

N.Y. Liberal Party — —

(Continued from page 1)

Partisan Committee with the hope of agreeing on a "good government candidate."

JAVITS DIDN'T MAKE IT

State Chairman Adolf A. Berle Jr. opened the meeting with a report on the negotiations and maneuvers to get a "non-partisan" candidate who would "rise above all parties" and any "narrow special interest" and bring order into the New York chaos. Despite some disagreement, the leadership at first tended toward Congressman Jacob Javits, Republican-Liberal from upper Manhattan, who threw his hat into the mayoralty ring some months ago.

Javits' eagerness for the post was viewed dimly by his fellow Republicans, in particular, Master Republican Thomas E. Dewey, governor of New York. Javits, while not exactly roaring like a lion in opposition to Dewey's rent-increase and fare-increase program for New York, did mumble a few disapproving words and thus incurred Republican displeasure. The Liberals, who have denounced the Dewey package, demanded a forthright answer from Javits.

As Berle delicately put it to Javits: Suppose there is a conflict of interest between the Republican Party and yourself as the non-partisan candidate dedicated to serve the best interest of the people, what would you do? Would your party interests be primary to you?

To Javits' credit, it must be said that he made his position crystal clear: he is a Republican first and would in no way break with his party. Certainly he would not denounce Dewey and commit political suicide—from his Republican point of view. He is not a Wayne Morse. (All of which raises the interesting question why this is unacceptable in Javits as a mayoralty candidate, but has been acceptable in Javits as a congressional candidate endorsed by the Liberals.)

DECISION HAILED

Hatters President Alex Rose reported that in the course of the discussions with the Republican leaders, it was apparent that they were decidedly cool toward Javits. Not one of their organization leaders came out for his candidacy. The Liberals kept pressing them for a definite commitment on whether they'd support Javits, and not until literally the 23rd hour did they whip up a list of 12 possible candidates for fusion with Javits reluctantly included. As he summarized it, Javits was too liberal for the Republicans, and too Republican for the Liberals. His call for Halley's election aroused a storm of applause at the conference.

"Practical" politicians as they are, the Liberal leaders could see little advantage in a fusion with the Republicans unless they got very solid guarantees that the candidate would not be knifed by the Republicans at voting time, as Newbold Morris and other candidates were. Javits could obviously not get the united support of the Republicans, and he was the only one of the 12 suggested fusion possibilities that the Liberals would even talk about.

Moreover, the voting in the Liberal clubs and the various polls was a landslide for Halley, and the leadership felt the heavy pressure from the ranks. A Javits' nomination would have had to be rammed down the throats of the membership.

EMBARRASSED?

David Dubinsky, president of the Ladies Garment Workers Union, indicated that he had not agreed with Berle and Rose and had been an early Halley supporter, but had gone along with their policy. He took up the prospect that Javits might still run for mayor but denied that it would embarrass the Liberal Party. The truth is, he asserted, that we're embarrassed everytime we endorse a Republican. The applause which greeted this statement ought to stop further

embarrassments—but unfortunately that cannot be too confidently expected.

The safari into the Republican jungles found no Livingstone. And so, reluctantly, hesitantly, against their first hopes, the leadership concluded that they would have to "go it alone" with Halley. Berle and Dubinsky attacked the Republicans for throwing in a final monkey wrench—the proviso that coalition on the top three offices would necessitate agreement on the lesser offices, such as borough presidencies. Here they would suffer real embarrassment—how could they not endorse "good" independent Democrats?

A BIT OF ALICE

While the leadership was forced to the final conclusion of Halley, he was the very first choice of the Liberal members, with little debate or soul-searching. After the reports, a parade of the county and union leaders of the party seconded the nomination and reflected the prevailing sentiment among the members.

Murray Baron, New York County chairman, drew laughter when he described the Alice-in-Wonderland situation in which the Liberal leaders had found themselves. There they were, urging the Republicans to support not a Liberal for office but a Republican—Javits. Not to be outdone, the Republicans countered by urging the Liberals to support a Democrat—Hogan (who incidentally has also been endorsed by the Liberals in the past and whose name has been proposed as a joint Democrat-Republican nominee).

The speakers gave a collective sigh of relief at the choice of Halley. Some of them pointed out the impossibility of supporting a Republican at the same time that the Liberals are denouncing the gangsterism and corruption in city politics. Where the Republicans can get their

share, they are in it as deep as they can go. Now they are lusting for the fleshpots in New York City—they already control state and national patronage. Speakers emphasized that only the Liberal Party has the welfare of the people truly at heart, and it's the only party with a program of social vision that can clean up New York, and take the heavy burdens off the backs of the workers of New York.

PUSHED

Some of the speakers indicated that they felt that a great historic step was being taken, but mostly they expressed their satisfaction that the party was running its own candidate and did not have to compromise its principles and program. ILG Vice President Luigi Antonini denounced the fusion policy as basically a "confusion policy" and declared he wouldn't have any truck with Republicans on any level—national, state, or city. Interestingly enough, he was the only one to state that he didn't care for Halley personally, but what was important to him was the Liberal Party. He said he viewed Halley as the instrument of the Liberal Party, and not vice versa, and that the party could become bigger and stronger from such a campaign.

In a sense, the Liberal Party leadership has been backed into its present course, and apparently at least a part of that leadership is taking it with some reluctance. It represents not so much a conscious change in their attitude on the question of independence, as it reflects the realities of the political situation which push the Liberal Party in the direction it is taking—realities which are furthermore effectively buttressed and concretized by the pressure of the party membership.

Bolivian Left — —

(Continued from page 4)

In spite of the crisis, the Stalinists are supporting the government, "critically" but in reality without conditions. They are collaborating in all ministries and political offices, especially in the ministry of administration and the intelligence service of the presidency.

The position of the "Left" makes impossible any political opposition by the workers against the Nationalists; and at the same time it will not collaborate with the Right opposition of the traditional capitalist parties or with the totalitarian Falange Socialista. The result is a very paradoxical situation: The government cannot solve the political and economic problems of the country and it is on the brink of bankruptcy and economic chaos, but there is no opposition sufficiently strong to overthrow the regime because there is no opposition which has the support of the workers and peasants.

The conservative policy of the "Left" has produced political stagnation, in the course of which the Nationalist regime is playing the role of a rightist, restorationist government and adopting reactionary, pro-capitalist methods.

BUREAUCRATIZED

We had written in support of the position taken by the Trotskyist POR, but now the POR's political organ has been adopting a position which is reactionary and disastrous. The POR has always collaborated with the Nationalists, and it helped to raise the Nationalist workers' bureaucracy—the group led by Juan Lechin—to its present power. While the offensive action of the masses was still going on, the POR assumed the role of a "loyal opposition" seeking to push the Nationalist regime into a more radical policy. At this critical point the government started to fight the POR's influence.

But all that now belongs to the "glorious past." Now the action of the masses has dwindled to a lower level, and with it has gone the opposition of the POR. Instead of making a turn to the left and engaging in stronger opposition, the POR has adopted the tactic of going along with and collaborating with the government, under the pretense of "saving the revolution."

On the other hand, the government ushered the Trotskyist "leaders" into very profitable positions in the official machinery, such as the Agrarian Commission, the Stabilization Office, the Workers' Security administration, etc. The PORist theoretician Alaya Mercado, is a member of the Agrarian Commission with a salary of 70,000 pesos, which is 100 per cent higher than a minister's

salary. Another "theoretician" of the POR, Lora, a collaborator of Lechin's, is now a member of the president's Stabilization Office. The secretary of the POR, Moller, is director of the Workers' Savings Bank (Caja de Seguro y Ahorro Obrero).

Many other POR militants have also gotten good posts in the official government machine. In this way the Nationalist government has liquidated the "Communist and Trotskyist" danger in Bolivia, and now the whole Bolivian "Left" is collaborating with the regime, with the claim that it is thus "saving the revolution" from capitalist restoration.

RETREAT

The focal points of working-class rebellion in the mines were liquidated through this collaboration policy of the "Left" and under the pressure of the well-paid labor bureaucracy. Now the workers, who were demanding indemnity pay and social benefits, are giving up their gains, somewhat as in Russia in the name of nationalist "revolution."

The nationalization of the mines in the capitalist way by the capitalist state meant the defeat of the workers' and peasants' movement and the defeat of their uprising, which was taken over by the petty-bourgeois Nationalists, who have become the bureaucrats themselves as state owners of the mines and means of production. They are engaged in building a state-capitalist economy and a reactionary political system.

The role of the "Left," Trotskyist as well as Stalinist, is one of support to this reactionary policy and betrayal of the historical and present interests of the working class and of socialism. Thus the general world tendency toward state-controlled capitalism finds expression also in a most backward country like Bolivia.

But there are counter-forces. The weakness of the Bolivian economy, the economic chaos, and the policy of the U. S., which is directed against Bolivian nationalization because of American imperialism's own interests, plus the opposition of the Bolivian semi-feudal bourgeoisie and former mine owners and landowners—these will probably be able to halt this process leading to a form of state-capitalism and open the way to a return to the old "liberal economy," with its low wages, stable currency and capitalist "democracy."

The principal responsibility for this political stagnation and advancing retrogressive movement falls on the Bolivian and Latin American "Left," in the first place on the Bolivian POR.

The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of exploitation which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism.

Capitalism cannot be reformed or liberalized, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so as to give the people freedom, abundance, security or peace. It must be abolished and replaced by a new social system, in which the people own and control the basic sectors of the economy, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism—a new form of exploitation. Its agents in every country, the Communist Parties, are unrelenting enemies of socialism and have nothing in common with socialism—which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today at each other's throats in a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power. Independent Socialism stands for building and strengthening the Third Camp of the people against both war blocs.

The ISL, as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle as the basic progressive force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of socialism in the labor movement and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialists participate actively in every struggle to better the people's lot now—such as the fight for higher living standards, against Jim Crow and anti-Semitism, in defense of civil liberties and the trade-union movement. We seek to join together with all other militants in the labor movement as a left force working for the formation of an independent labor party and other progressive policies.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism are inseparable. There can be no lasting and genuine democracy without socialism, and there can be no socialism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!

Get Acquainted!

Independent Socialist League
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, N. Y.

- I want more information about the ideas of Independent Socialism and the ISL.
- I want to join the ISL.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

The Handy Way to Subscribe!

LABOR ACTION
Independent Socialist Weekly
114 West 14 Street
New York 11, New York

- Please enter my subscription:
- 1 year at \$2. New
 - 6 months at \$1. Renewal
 - Payment enclosed. Bill me.

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY

ZONE STATE

There's No Angel Around

to finance LABOR ACTION. It has appeared every week since 1940 because it's been backed by the dimes and dollars of independent socialists — AND YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS.

A sub is only \$2 a year—
Subscribe now!